

of course, it is the only dog in this hunt at this time.

Let me suggest something. Yesterday, I ran out of time when I was talking about the Regulatory Reform Act, and there are a couple of examples that I wanted to use. I had used some examples from around the country, but I did not use the local examples.

Once before, when we were talking about Superfund abuse, which we are dealing with here also, I told the story of a very close personal friend of mine in Tulsa, OK. His name is Jimmy Dunn. His family has Mill Creek Lumber Co. It is the third generation to run this lumber company—highly competitive. It is in an environment in which many of them do not exist; they are not able to survive.

He called me up. At that time, I was a Member of the House. He said, "Congressman INHOFE, the EPA has just put me out of business." I said, "What did you do wrong?" And Jimmy Dunn said, "I don't think I did anything wrong, but for the last 10 years we have been using the same contractor to sell our used crankcase oil." And that contractor was licensed by the Federal Government; he was licensed by the State Government; he was licensed by Tulsa County, and yet they traced some of the crankcase oil from this contractor to the Double Eagle Superfund site.

He read the letter he received from the administrator of the EPA, the last paragraph of which said we are going to impose \$25,000-a-day fines on you and possible criminal sanctions.

Now, we were able to stop that, but for every one that we find out about and are able to help, there are thousands that we do not find out about.

I had a visitor in my office yesterday who is the administrator of the endangered species here and a very nice lady, and we visited about it. She said, "Well, I can count on both hands the number of prosecutions we have had. It is fictitious to say that we are being abusive in the Endangered Species Act." I said, "You miss the point altogether." For each one that is ultimately a conviction or a prosecution, you have 100,000 of them out there that are threats, that are threatening those people who are working hard, making money to pay taxes for all this fun that we are having up here.

I have a guy that I met 4 days before Christmas. His name is Keith Carter. Keith Carter lives in a little town in Oklahoma—Skiatook, OK—just north of Tulsa, OK. It is a very small community. Keith Carter developed a spray that he puts on horses. I do not know what it does, but apparently there is a market for it. Keith Carter called me 4 days before Christmas and Keith Carter said, "Congressman, EPA has just put me out of business and I have to fire my only four employees 4 days before Christmas."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. INHOFE. I ask unanimous consent for 2 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. INHOFE. I thank the Chair. I do want to finish this story.

What had happened in the case of Keith Carter is that Keith Carter had moved his location from his basement up the street three houses for a larger place. He told the EPA regional office in Texas about it, but he did not tell the office in Washington, and so they took away his number. So we got his number back. It took 3 weeks to do it. Finally, we got his number back.

He called me back. He said, "Congressman, I have another problem; now I can't use my inventory, 25,000 dollars' worth of silkscreen bottles, because they have the old number on them." Well, this is the type of harassment that has taken place.

Lastly, since the Senator from Tennessee brought this up, there is a brilliant guy, a Dr. Bruce Yandle from Clemson University, that made a discovery that everyone should focus on at this time. We are all concerned about deficits. What he discovered was—and he skewed this draft out for us—that there is a direct relationship between the number of pages in the Federal Register, which indicates the number of regulations, and the deficit. These yellow bars down here signify and represent the deficits during these years starting all the way back in 1950 going up to the current year. And if you look at this, it follows exactly along the line of the pages in the Federal Register. So, I would say to those individuals, if you are looking for another excuse, if you do not believe that we have an obtrusive, abusive Government, then look at it from a fiscal standpoint. If you really want to balance the budget, to eliminate the deficit, there is no single greater thing we can do than stop the excessive regulations in our society. And this is our opportunity to do it.

Thank you, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas is recognized under the previous order to speak for up to 10 minutes.

Mrs. KASSEBAUM. I thank the Chair.

(The remarks of Mrs. KASSEBAUM and Mr. KENNEDY pertaining to the introduction of S. 1028 are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Mr. DORGAN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senator from North Dakota is recognized to speak for up to 15 minutes.

#### COMPREHENSIVE REGULATORY REFORM ACT

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, the subject on the floor of the Senate is regulatory reform. It is an important issue. Nearly all of us in this Chamber know that there are many Americans confronted these days with regulations that they think do not represent com-

mon sense, regulations that are too burdensome, regulations that do not seem appropriate or right. I understand that. I think some of that does exist. And when and where it exists, we ought to put an end to it. Americans have enough trouble without having to deal with regulations that do not make sense.

But the story of regulations is a story with more than one chapter. Another part of the regulations story is the regulations that we have put in place that improve life in this country; regulations that require inspection of food so that we have safe food to eat; regulations that require an approval by the Food and Drug Administration of drugs that are being proposed to be marketed in this country so that consumers have some confidence that these drugs are safe; regulations that prohibit big corporations from dumping their chemicals into our streams and into our lakes and rivers; regulations that prohibit big corporations from pouring pollution into our air. Many of those regulations are critically important, and we ought to keep them.

It is interesting, most of what we see in the Congress is a debate about failure, it is never much a debate about success. Let me just for a moment describe for my colleagues a success.

Today, we use twice as much energy in this country than we did 20 years ago, but we have in this country today, by all standards of measurement, cleaner air. Why would we have cleaner air, less pollution, less smog in this country today than we did 20 years ago if we use twice as much energy? Because this country and this Congress said we are going to change the way we behave in this country; we are not going to allow polluters to any longer pollute the air; we are going to require them to clean up their emissions. And the result is a success story. It has been the Clean Air Act, with all of its imperfections, that has stopped the degradation of America's air. That is a success.

Should we retreat on that? Should we decide that regulations that require corporations to stop polluting are burdensome so, therefore, they should not have to stop polluting? Should we go back to the good old days where we dump all this pollution into the air and let our kids breathe it and say it does not matter, that we can deal with the consequences later? I do not think so. I do not think the American people would believe that we want to go back to those days.

How about water? There is a book by Gregg Easterbrook recently published that talks about these success stories. We have less acid rain and cleaner water these days than we had 20, 25 years ago. You all remember the story about the Hudson River starting on fire.

Now why would a river start to burn? Because of this enormous amount of pollution that was going on in this

country. Now our rivers and lakes and streams are cleaner and we have less acid rain. Why is that the case? Is it because someone decided in a corporate boardroom someplace we really have to stop doing this, we have to spend money to stop doing it to clean up our water? No, it is not because of that. It is because Congress decided this ought to stop and that reasonable regulations and rules ought to require the big polluters to stop polluting. The result is, we have cleaner air and cleaner water.

Are all these regulations perfect? No, not at all. Should some be changed? Yes. But should we retreat in this country on the requirement with reasonable regulations to say to those who would pollute our air and water you have to stop polluting? Of course not. We should not retreat on that. What we have done there is a success story for our country.

Should we retreat on food safety? Of course not. That is not what the American people expect us to be doing.

Now, I have been interested in the way this debate has gone here in the Senate. It has gone like every other bill we have seen this year. A bill is brought to the floor of the Senate and, within hours, the majority party starts complaining about the minority party stalling. Well, this bill was brought to the floor of the Senate much as regulatory reform bills were brought to the committee on which I serve, the Governmental Affairs Committee. The first such bill we saw in committee was a moratorium, a regulatory moratorium; and the majority party thought, gee, this really sounds great, we will just stop everything, no more rules will be issued. No more regulations will be issued. We will stop them in their tracks until a time certain later.

Some of us said that does not make sense. We said the bill does not discriminate between good and bad rules, good regulations and bad regulations. We decided to offer some amendments. And so we offered amendments on *E. coli*, on clean water, on cryptosporidium, on mammography standards, on commuter airline safety standards, which we were sure the majority party did not want to interrupt. Did they really want to interrupt a regulation that establishes the reasonable standards for mammography screenings for breast cancer? No; it turns out that is not really what they intended to do. What about *E. coli*? Did they intend to allow for degradation of food safety standards? No; it turns out they did not intend to do that either. We went through a whole series of amendments, and it turns out that is not what they really intended to do.

Well, they come to the floor with a regulatory reform proposal, and we have a number of amendments that we are prepared to offer. The fact is that you cannot get amendments up on the floor. Oh, we got one up yesterday and it took all day. The folks that offered the amendment were ready to vote at noon. We did not vote until the end of

the day. Why? Well, because the other side is stalling, and they accuse us of delaying. That is a curious, interesting approach to legislative strategy. You stall and accuse the other side of delay. So far, there have been 16 amendments offered on this bill; 14 of the 16 have been offered by the other side, and only two by those who want to change the bill or would support a substitute to the bill.

If we want to finish this bill—and I do—and if we want to move ahead—and I think we should—we ought to decide to allow all these amendments to be offered, the amendments that address the specific issues. Do you intend really to degrade seafood safety standards? I do not think so. Let us offer an amendment to guarantee that is not the case. Do you intend to undercut and degrade clean air standards? I do not think so. Let us decide we want to vote on that.

Let us offer those amendments. I expect most people would be willing to offer them expeditiously, with time agreements, and we will vote on them. And no one, in my judgment, could genuinely suggest anyone here is stalling. The stall comes from those who bring the bill to the floor but do not want amendments offered that they do not want to vote on. That is the stall. I understand that. But it is not the way we ought to do bills. There are good regulations and bad regulations. We ought to get rid of the bad and keep the good.

I heard somebody this morning talk about the burden. We place an unfair burden on America's corporations with respect to regulations. Well, I will tell you, some corporations have relieved themselves of that burden. Two or three applications a day are being approved for new plants on the maquiladora border, south of the Mexican-United States border—two or three a day. These are new American plants that move to Mexico. Why do they move down there? Because Mexico is a place where they can produce things differently than in our country. First of all, it is much cheaper; they can pay lower wages, and often they can hire kids.

Second, they do not have the enforcement on environmental controls. You can move your plant to Mexico and pollute. You do not have to be burdened by all of those unreasonable standards in the United States; if you are going to produce something, you should not pollute water and air. So it costs less to produce there.

Is it right? Is that the future? Is that what we want to have happen? I do not think so. Is the answer to it to decide we should not burden them, that they should pollute while in this country? I do not think that is the case either.

I think we have provided some good leadership with respect to our set of regulations on requiring polluters to stop polluting, in requiring those who are involved in processing the meat in this country to process it in conditions that we feel are safe for the American

consumer. I do not understand those who believe that these are burdens on America's corporations that must be relieved with a bill that cannot be amended because they do not want to vote on these specific issues.

We have been treated in recent months to a lot of very substantial reforms, some of which I have thought made a lot of sense, some of which should have been passed when the Democrats controlled the Congress and were not. It is our fault. I voted for some of these reforms. I voted for unfunded mandates. I thought it made a lot of sense. I voted for the line-item veto. Some of these reforms make sense.

Some of these reforms brought to the floor of the Senate are inherently radical reforms, responding to the big money interests of this country. Regulatory reform, for anybody who is interested, has been largely written by the special interests, by the large corporate interests, largely written by the large corporate interests who want to get out from the burden of costly regulations. I understand that. I understand why they want to do that. But the public interest has been established here from our perspective that we want that burden imposed to require clean air and water and safe food and the rest.

We had a fight in North Dakota in the 1970's when they were going to process coal to produce electricity. I and the then Governor decided the only way we were going to give water permits was to fight for the latest available technology to be put on those plants, which included then wet scrubbers, very expensive environmental control technology, in order to protect North Dakota's air. Well, obviously, the coal industry and others who were processing that coal, the electric generating industry, did not want any part of that. They did not want that. Why? Because it costs money. I understand why. I understand why they fought it. But we were right and we insisted on it, and we now have those coal-fired generating plants in North Dakota. But the fact is the latest available technology was included on those plants, which included wet scrubbers to reduce the effluent that goes into the air. I cannot be more pleased about the fight I was involved in in the 1970's requiring that that happen. We were considered fairly radical at the time. We were environmentalists. We were trying to impose costs on industry. Yes, we were. We wanted those who purchased the electricity from those plants to help pay the costs of keeping the air clean. Is that radical? Well, it was called radical, but I do not happen to think it is. I think it is right.

I am a little tired of special interests beating the drum and calling the tune in this town, to suggest that somehow they now need their burdens relieved—especially when they tell us of those burdens of having to comply with the Clean Air Act, Clean Water Act, food safety standards, and the like.

Yes, let us have regulatory reform, and let us do it in the right way. Let us be aggressive in making sure that regulations make good common sense. Let us get rid of silly, useless regulations, and let us get rid of the people that write those kinds of regulations. But, at the same time, let us make sure that we protect this country with reasonable regulations that protect our air, water, food safety, and more. That ought to be the job for all of us on the floor of this Senate. There ought not be any disagreement about it. Nor should there be disagreement about whether anybody is stalling. If the majority party will simply allow those who believe that amendments are necessary to this bill to be offered and debated, this bill will move, and move quickly—with proper amendments.

But it is disingenuous, in my judgment, to be delaying because you do not want to vote on amendments, and then accuse the other side of stalling. That is not much of a legislative strategy and will not produce much of a result for this country.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. SIMPSON addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CAMPBELL). Under the previous order, the Senator from Wyoming is recognized to speak for up to 10 minutes.

(The remarks of Mr. SIMPSON and Mr. BINGAMAN pertaining to the introduction of S. 1029 are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

#### EXTENDING TIME FOR FILING FIRST-DEGREE AMENDMENTS—S. 343

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, on behalf of the leader, I ask unanimous consent that, notwithstanding the provisions of rule XXII, all Senators have until 5 p.m. today in order to file first-degree amendments to the pending Dole-Johnston substitute to S. 343, the regulatory reform bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DOLE. Madam President, was leader time reserved?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

#### DISASTER IN SREBRENICA

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I had hoped that the profound disaster in Srebrenica would have provoked a greater response from this administration than what we have seen in the last 48 hours. Tens of thousands of Bosnians have fled, Dutch peacekeepers are being held hostage, young girls are being taken away by Bosnian Serb forces, and the two other eastern enclaves—also U.N. designated safe havens—are under continued attack. Yet, instead of leadership, all the administration has to offer is press spokesmen to defend this catastrophe.

The best defense would be a change in the present approach. However, that

is unlikely from what the cadre of administration spokesmen have said.

Despite the obviousness of this colossal failure, Western leaders cling stubbornly to the myth that no other options exist.

There are reports that the administration is working with the allies to withdraw U.N. forces from the Eastern enclaves and redeploy them in central Bosnia and Sarajevo. In my view, this would be redefining failure.

I remind my colleagues that in the spring of 1993, Secretary Christopher went to Europe with the lift-and-strike plan and returned with the joint action plan. This plan was sold as the humanitarian option. The option that put the Bosnians' interests first. The joint action plan committed the United States, Britain, France, Russia, and the European Union to the protection of six U.N.-designated safe havens and closing the borders between Serbia and Bosnia.

There are those of us who urged the administration not to go along with this so-called plan, who warned that creating giant refugee camps with minimal defense would support Serbian war aims. We were ignored.

I might say these suggestions came not just from this side but on both sides of the aisle.

The administration went ahead and what a trade. Two years later Milosevic is still sending supplies and troops across the border and, the Bosnians are not only defenseless, but undefended.

Now we are faced with a widening catastrophe, but there is no longer any attempt to save the Bosnians—only to save face. The rapid reaction force is intended to save face.

I believe that the United Nations must begin preparations for withdrawal immediately. I am prepared to support the use of U.S. forces, if they are necessary, but under strict conditions.

If we have to use U.S. forces, it is going to be because of a total lack of policy by the Clinton administration. We are going to be backed into the use of U.S. forces because of a lack of clear leadership by this administration. That should be clear to everyone.

But even having said that, we have some obligations and I would be willing to support use of U.S. forces—under strict conditions.

First, unified NATO command—no dual key.

Second, robust rules of engagement which provide for massive retaliation if any U.S. forces are attacked.

Third, all necessary measures are taken to protect United States and NATO personnel from likely threats—from any source, to include Serbia—to include the suppression of Serbian air defenses.

Fourth, no risking U.S. lives to save equipment.

Fifth, agreement from our allies to lift the arms embargo on Bosnia.

The administration must know that it will be held responsible and that if

these conditions are not met, the risk to U.S. forces will be far greater than necessary.

Mr. President, the United Nations must withdraw and the arms embargo must be lifted. The United States cannot continue to subsidize and support a U.N. mission that serves largely to supervise ethnic cleansing and aggression. The United States must exercise leadership and support the fundamental right of self-defense.

I listened last night to one of the spokesmen, a White House press person, talking about Bosnia. He said, "Well, we cannot afford to lift the arms embargo. That would cost us money."

What does he think we are spending now? We are spending a great deal of money, and we are picking up 31 percent of the tab right now in Bosnia. Hundreds and hundreds of millions of dollars have been spent by the U.S. taxpayers. So I wish if they are going to trot out the press spokesmen, at least they should have the facts correct and tell the American people the truth, and give them an accurate report of what is actually happening.

I yield the floor.

#### WAS CONGRESS IRRESPONSIBLE? LOOK AT THE ARITHMETIC

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, on that evening in 1972 when I learned that I had been elected to the Senate, I made a commitment to myself that I would never fail to see any young person, or any group of young people, who wanted to see me.

It has proved enormously beneficial to me because I have been inspired by the estimated 60,000 young people with whom I have visited during the nearly 23 years I have been in the Senate.

Most of them have been concerned about the magnitude of the Federal debt that Congress has run up for the coming generations to pay. The young people and I always discuss the fact that under the U.S. Constitution, no President can spend a dime of Federal money that has not first been authorized and appropriated by both the House and Senate of the United States.

That is why I began making these daily reports to the Senate on February 22, 1992. I wanted to make a matter of daily record of the precise size of the Federal debt which as of yesterday, Wednesday, July 12, stood at \$4,927,810,673,266.79 or \$18,706.05 for every man, woman, and child in America on a per capita basis.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Under the previous order, the Senator from Pennsylvania, [Mr. SPECTER]